## EXHIBIT 3

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
3			
4			
5	UNITED STATES OF AN	X MERICA	13-CR-6036(L)
7	VS.	ndant.	Rochester, New York December 17th, 2014 3:00 p.m.
8	WILLIAM MILLER, Defe		
9	X		
10			DD TWGG
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID G. LARIMER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
12			
13	WILLIAM J. HOCHUL, JR., United States Attorney		
14	BY: CRAIG R. GESTRING, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorney		
15	6200 Federal Build: Rochester, New York		ing
16			
17	-	CHRISTIAN J. KENNER 45 Exchange Bouleva Rochester, New York	ard, Suite 802
18	-	Appearing on behalf	
19			
20	ALSO PRESENT:	David Spogen, U.S.	Probation Office
21	AUDIO RECORDER:	Paul Rand	
22	TRANSCRIBER:	Christi A. Macri, Kenneth B. Keating	
23		100 State Street, I Rochester, New York	Room 2120
24	•		
25	(Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by computer).		

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 3 (WHEREUPON, the defendant is present). 4 THE COURT: Good afternoon, all. 5 MR. KENNEDY: Good afternoon, Judge. MR. GESTRING: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Mr. Gestring and Mr. Kennedy. may come a time when Mr. Miller wishes to speak. certainly can sit. We do have a portable mic here if that 10 would help you. We're taping, so it's important that we hear 11 what it is that he has to say, if he wishes to speak. 12 MR. KENNEDY: Okay. 13 THE COURT: What's your preference, Mr. Kennedy? MR. KENNEDY: Judge, when he needs to address the 14 15 Court that won't be a problem for us to get closer. THE COURT: All right, you can hear me all right, 16 Mr. Miller? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. Parties ready for 20 sentencing? 21 MR. GESTRING: Government's ready, Judge. 22 MR. KENNEDY: Yes, Judge. 23 THE COURT: Thank you for accommodating us today, 24 Mr. Gestring. 25 MR. GESTRING: Government's always ready to proceed, Judge.

2.2

THE COURT: We're here based on Mr. Miller's plea back in May to a one count information charging coercement or enticement of a minor to engage in sexual activity involving a person under the age of 18. That person or persons entered into with Mr. Miller the production of certain photographs deemed to be -- constitute child pornography.

Based on the statute and the charge, Mr. Miller faces a mandatory 10 year term of imprisonment, maximum up to life.

The agreement also agreed that Mr. Miller would forfeit the camera and the SD card that was used.

The facts are set forth in the plea agreement and in the presentence report, indicate that a search warrant was issued by the Rochester Police Department at Mr. Miller's residence on Electric Avenue for matters unrelated to the present charge.

In the process of executing that warrant, the officers discovered items unrelated to this, but also a camera. A subsequent search warrant was obtained, the camera was examined and viewed and the several pictures that are at issue here were discovered.

Minor victims were interviewed and indicated their involvement; one of the child's mothers also confirmed the identity of the child, and also indicated her knowledge of...

The plea was entered pursuant to a plea agreement. The parties are familiar with. The Probation Department did the calculations, and the guideline calculations, as is often the case in child pornography and child pornography related cases, is quite high.

2.3

The Probation Department determined with Mr. Miller's significant criminal history, he is a level VI, the highest. The net offense level is 37, and according to the guidelines, that provides for a sentence of 360 months to life.

The guideline calculations at the time of the plea, all of them were agreed to. The victims involved were under 16.

There was "sexual contact" involved.

The child victims were under the "care, custody, supervision" of Mr. Miller.

A computer was used.

So there do not appear to be much surprise relative to the guidelines. In fact, the guideline range that I just mentioned is the same the parties anticipated it would be at the time of the plea.

So that's where we are relative to guidelines. Of course, the Court, as counsel knows, must view all the factors under the sentencing statute, Section 3553(a) of Title 18 and impose a sentence that it believes is sufficient, but not more

1 than necessary.

Я

2.0

I have received filings from you all, in addition to the presentence report, which I referenced; the plea agreement I have reviewed.

I have received the Government's statement with respect to sentencing factors filed March -- excuse me,

March -- filed December 9th recommending a guideline sentence.

I do have, Mr. Kennedy, your statement with respect to sentencing factors filed in early December raising concerns and objections, comments relative to sentencing.

First things first. From your submission,

Mr. Kennedy, on page -- I can't point -- in reviewing your

submissions, it appears that you did not have any objections
to the mathematical computation of the guideline range; is

that correct?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, Judge. Are you referring to just the information that I included in my response to the PSR making reference to be an outstanding statement? Because I did -- the only thing that's challenged in the PSR or corrected was that that matter had been resolved in state court and what the resolution was. That was the only -- not even objection, but just correction.

THE COURT: All right. But as to the -- the recited guideline calculation here is based on the criminal history category, offense level, guideline range, calls for a

```
sentence of 360 to life. I know you don't agree that should
  be the sentence, but my inquiry is do you have any objection
   to any of the material matters set forth in the presentence
 3
   report?
               MR. KENNEDY: No, Judge.
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Miller, have you also had a chance
 6
   to review the presentence report?
 7
               MR. KENNEDY: Reviewed the presentence report that
 8
   we went over.
                THE DEFENDANT: Not a real good chance, Your Honor,
10
   because of the information that was involved in it, I didn't
11
   have the opportunity to really sit down in the facility I was
12
   at and look at it.
13
                I think I basically understand it.
14
               MR. KENNEDY: We went over it together.
15
               THE COURT: Pardon me?
16
17
               THE DEFENDANT: We went over it together,
   Mr. Kennedy and I.
18
19
               THE COURT: You had a copy of the report and you
   reviewed it with Mr. Kennedy?
20
21
               THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry?
                THE COURT: Did you have a copy of the report or at
22
23
   least reviewed Mr. Kennedy's --
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24
```

THE COURT: Did he come down to see you down in

25

New York? 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2. THE COURT: All right and that's the time you went 3 over the presentence report? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. THE COURT: All right. Do you think you need 6 additional time to review the report today? 7 THE DEFENDANT: I don't think so, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Well, now's the time. 9 Mr. Kennedy, do you believe you've had a fair and 10 full opportunity to review this report with your client? 11 MR. KENNEDY: Yes, we did go over it and discuss 12 the contents and what I would be submitting to the Court. 13 believe so, yes. 14 THE COURT: All right. Well, there being no 15 objection to any of the matters in the presentence report, 16 I'll find the guidelines are as indicated and find that they 17 were correctly determined by the probation officer. 18 That I quess is our start point, those are the 19 I think the matter about the state court that 20 quidelines. you referenced was Mr. Miller's subsequent conviction in state 21 court of the misdemeanor charge of endangering the welfare of 22 a child? 23 MR. KENNEDY: That's correct. 24

THE COURT: For which I guess he received time

25

served?

2 MR. KENNEDY: That's the information I was -- yes, 3 Judge, that's my understanding.

THE COURT: All right. So I take it from that and also from discussing this with Probation Officer Spogen that there's no other pending state charges?

MR. KENNEDY: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. At this point the Court must allow counsel and Mr. Miller to speak to the matter. I certainly received your papers and I'm certainly very aware of what the guidelines are in this case.

So I guess, Mr. Kennedy, I'll turn it over to you first. I don't think everybody has to repeat everything that's said in the papers because I've been doing this for a long time and I know precisely what the positions are, but nonetheless, you may speak to the matters.

MR. KENNEDY: Judge, as Your Honor has stated, I know you've read the papers and I won't recite everything that I submitted to the Court.

Mr. Miller has requested due to his lengthy medical issues that as opposed to the Court making reference to him being housed as close to Rochester -- or as close to home as possible, that I believe it is the medical facility in North Carolina called Butner, if the Court might make a suggestion to the Bureau of Prisons that might be the

appropriate place for him to serve his sentence?

And another issue concerning the sentence itself when the Court does impose it, when Mr. Miller was arrested originally on these charges -- well, when he went into custody he was in the hospital. The state lodged these charges. The charges, as the Court made reference to, the initial search warrant had to do with some cigarettes. Those charges were lodged against him and they didn't lodge the federal charges until after his release from prison. I guess the policy is the marshals or the FBI won't -- they won't put somebody on guard, so they didn't lodge the charges.

And since, it took the state attorneys approximately six to eight months to get him in primary federal custody by getting the hold in state court lifted enough to have that happen.

Under the circumstances because those sentences have all been completed or time served, they shouldn't effect his time, but I would ask if the Court might be willing to make concurrent to the state charges any sentence that it does impose just so his time that he has been in will be credited towards it.

As far as the sentencing itself --

THE COURT: Say that again.

MR. KENNEDY: Pardon?

THE COURT: If he's already served his sentence, I'm

1 not sure there's anything for me to run my sentence concurrent 2 or consecutive to.

MR. KENNEDY: Judge, how I'm -- I agree in the sense that the sentences are -- have been terminated. My client wanted me to make this request.

I told him my understanding would be that he would be getting the credit for that because the sentence in state court was time served and it wouldn't consume the time that he had been lodged in when he wasn't in primary federal custody, but he asked that I make that request.

THE COURT: My understanding is -- well, two things. First of all, the Bureau of Prisons makes determinations as to where Mr. Miller will serve his sentence. I certainly will recommend he serve it at a medical facility, I'll recommend Butner. Butner is a pretty popular facility, so it's up to the Bureau of Prisons. There are other medical facilities, but I'll recommend Butner. I don't think he's ever been there.

MR. KENNEDY: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Point two, the Bureau of Prisons decides matters of credit. It seems clear that Mr. Miller will get credit for any time he's actually been in primary federal custody.

There are circumstances that the state charges related to the federal charge, that the Bureau of Prisons

might give him credit for that also, but that's a matter that the Bureau of Prisons determines, not this Court.

As far as I'm concerned, he'll get whatever credit he's entitled to, but it's a BOP decision, not District Court decision.

## MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Judge.

With regards to the substance of my submissions to the Court, the other thing I would bring up because as the Court has stated, Mr. Miller's criminal history category is extremely lengthy in the sense of the number of convictions there are.

And I would just -- I'm sure the Court read my submissions and also reviewed the papers carefully to see that just about all of them are misdemeanor convictions. There's no convictions of violence.

Mr. Miller's history, I will leave to my submissions the status of Mr. Miller's medical situation and just ask the Court to impose what it feels is the appropriate sentence in this matter in light of what we've submitted to the Court.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

Mr. Miller, the rules provide that at this point you have the right to make a statement to me, the sentencing judge. You don't have to make a statement, but if you wish to, the Court will hear it.

If you do make a statement, just keep your voice up 1 because we are taping here. 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 3 THE COURT: If you want to stand if you're able, 4 that's fine. If not, we have a portable mic that you can use 5 6 and it works quite well. THE DEFENDANT: I would just like to apologize to 7 8 the Court, to the victim, the family, to my friends and family, to myself for putting myself in a stupid position. 9 And I can assure you it was an isolated incident. 10 I've never done, never will and I'm just hoping that the Court 11 12 will give me leniency. THE COURT: All right. Anything else? Thank you. 13 THE DEFENDANT: I think that's all, Your Honor, 14 15 thank you. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gestring, the 16 Government's thoughts, if any? 17 MR. GESTRING: Yes, Judge, thank you. 18 19 Judge, I would start by reminding the Court that 20 he's already received a significant sentencing benefit by 21 virtue of pleading to enticement, which is a 10 year mandatory minimum as opposed to production, which is a 15 year mandatory 22 2.3 minimum, which the facts clearly support. 24 Judge, applying the 3553(a) factors to this 25 defendant, they clearly support the imposition of a quideline

```
sentence. In the defendant's sentencing statement, Judge,
specifically at paragraph 12 he references how the nature and
circumstances of the offense and the history and
characteristics of the defendant should be the primary factors
```

for this Court to consider, and we agree with that, Judge.

But it's our position, Judge, when applying those factors to the 3553(a) factors, that they clearly favor a quideline sentence.

Judge, this is not a stupid position. The defendant just said for the stupid position that he's in.

This is not a stupid position. This is a sexual crime of violence against a child.

He did more than simply view sexually explicit photos of a 12-year-old girl, Judge. He produced them. He did so using threats and bribes. He did so to a child that he knew that he had custody and care over, Judge.

The child trusted him, the child's family trusted him.

There's some material in the defendant's sentencing statement about how the defendant hasn't sexually abused a child. And effectively just now Mr. Miller said this is a one time deal and I can't really be held accountable for a one time sort of lack of judgment.

That's not the case, Judge. This was not a single episode. There were multiple episodes involving multiple

victims. Judge, he physically touched children and he produced sexually explicit photographs of those children.

Those videos, Judge, they graphically focus on a 12-year-old girl's vagina. And it's not a question, it's not he's artistically looking at the wall and then just happened. He get right there, his hand is in the video, Judge. He manually spreads the young girl's legs so he can get a closer view.

This is not a stupid position, Judge. This is again a crime of violence against a child.

Judge, the Government's position is that he is, in fact, a high-risk of harming a child based on what he's already done and certainly what he's capable of doing.

Saying that he's a low risk, Judge, is like saying that I'm short. I might be short compared to the Globe Trotters, but saying that he's not a risk is sort of like saying that a grizzly bear at a slumber party is a low risk.

Judge, he is very high-risk. He's shown that he's sexually interested in minors. He's shown an interest not only in sexually exploiting them, but in actually touching them and he did so with more than one child, Judge.

MR. KENNEDY: Judge, I'm sorry to interrupt, but

I'm not sure where these allegations are coming from. I know
he made reference to some --

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Gestring didn't

interrupt you. I'll give you a chance to reply if you wish.

Mr. Gestring.

MR. GESTRING: Thank you, Judge. I would just refer back to the presentence investigation report and the facts brought out through Probation, I think paragraph 33 refers to sexual contact with more than one victim.

The victim in this case with respect to the production of child pornography, but with respect to the touching the other child's breasts, the buttocks, that's contained in the presentence investigation report to which there was no objection, Judge.

With respect to the Court's concerns about the 2G2.2 guidelines, I know that I've had this conversation with the Court before in other cases, certainly with other facts, Judge, and it's our position that the defendant's written submission, which contains challenges to the 2G2.2 and what we'll call the *Dorve* argument simply don't apply here.

Factually, Judge, the case is -- this case and the Dorve case are completely different. The Dorve case didn't involve a real child, Judge. It was an undercover. The Dorve case didn't involve physical contact. Here it did. And the Dorve case involved distribution as opposed to production.

Moreover, Judge, the guidelines, the enhancements that are traditionally challenged under the 2G2.2 analysis

with which this Court has previously expressed concerns are not relevant here. They don't apply here. These aren't the generic, as the Court thinks of them, the generic ones that apply to everybody. These are specific. Again, like The Mikado, the punishment fits the crime here, Judge.

These enhancements apply to this particular offense. He gets an enhancement because he had care and custody of the child. He gets an enhancement because he had sexual contact with the child.

These are not present in every single production case. These are specific to this case and, therefore, Judge, it's our position that that type of a challenge simply doesn't stand here.

I would like to address, Judge, the history and characteristics of the defendant, which simply cry out for a guideline sentence. Judge, in preparing the case for sentencing, reviewing the PSI, which is 36 pages, 22 pages of that are criminal history.

The criminal history category is VI based on an astonishing 48. Judge, it should be noted that this crime, the crime that the defendant is here in federal court for, was committed while he was on probation for previous state conduct, and that is significant and the Court should and must take notice of that under 3553(a), Judge, for sentencing.

Judge, I think with respect to his criminal

history, I do agree with Mr. Kennedy that the majority of his conduct are misdemeanors and it's clear that he didn't -- has not served a significant sentence of incarceration yet.

But that absolutely goes to the Court's consideration of deterrence as a factor, Judge. The only way to stop him, the only way to deter him is with a significant period of incarceration, Judge.

It is clear that none of his prior contacts over 22 pages has stopped him from committing new crimes because he committed this child exploitation crime, this crime of violence against a 12-year-old after he's had all those other convictions, Judge.

Judge, with respect to his medical condition, I would note that it didn't stop him from committing this crime. It didn't stop him from sexually exploiting a 12-year-old or her friend. And it didn't stop him, more significantly, Judge, from continuing his conduct while he was incarcerated.

As referenced in our filings, Judge, and I think that previous hearings have made -- have made reference to, the defendant has been involved in altercations while in custody and those altercations were not where he was the victim, but rather where he was the aggressor.

So his medical condition, while set forth in the pleadings, is not sufficient in our belief to merit some type of consideration for that, Judge.

Judge, I think when the Court considers the material submitted by the defendant, specifically his letter, I think he fails -- he minimizes his crime and his conduct and that's something the Court should consider again under the 3553(a) factors.

Judge, bottom line here is that this defendant is sexually dangerous. This defendant is a threat, is a risk to children. He's already received a significant sentencing break by virtue of him pleading to a 10 year mandatory instead of a 15 year mandatory.

All the parties, Judge, agreed to the guidelines.

Agreed not to recommend a sentence outside of the guidelines.

It's our position, Judge, that this defendant, when you apply those 3553(a) factors individually to him, individually to his crime, individually to his history and to his individual characteristics, that the Court should impose a guideline sentence.

Thank you.

2.4

2.5

THE COURT: Any wish for rejoinder?

MR. KENNEDY: Judge, just very briefly. The allegations of multiple defendants (sic), the PSR makes reference to some of the investigation that was done or comments that were made by complainants and that's why they weren't objected to because I don't have any doubt that the comments were made.

There was never an indictment or charging
instrument in state court or in federal court where there was
more than one complainant.

There's never been a conviction of any type of touching. There was an allegation that said, I believe gave them titty twisters and slapped them on the butt is what he was referring to when he said physical contact, which again, there's never been any type of state or federal substantiated charges -- substantiate that allegation.

I just wanted to bring that to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: The Court must consider many factors in deciding a sentence that's sufficient, but not more than necessary.

And I understand the Government's position that the guidelines suggested are -- is the appropriate sentence.

It's the consistent position of the United States Attorney's Office here that the guidelines are always the appropriate sentence. And that's fine, the Government can make whatever recommendations they want.

But we are talking, Mr. Gestring, about a 30 year sentence. And I understand the office has policy requesting these, but that, of course, is a most substantial sentence. I can't think of any other crime -- murder on down -- that requires that kind of sentence.

I'm not nay saying any of the things you said that suggest that a significant sentence should apply, but it is 30 years to life, which is about as high as you can get.

And I'll admit, at least I concur with you, that at least what Mr. Miller did was a terrible crime. I guess that's the question, whether it warrants a 30 year sentence.

I can't think of the right adjective, but I'm sure you're familiar with the phrase parens patrie, that the state often acts sort of in the parental role, especially of children. There are state courts that deal just with children; family court that deals with children.

And in reviewing this, the -- I don't know how to characterize it as irony, that in state court for what Mr. Miller was alleged to have done here and pleaded guilty to doing, he's allowed to plead guilty to a misdemeanor crime of endangering the welfare of a child.

We have that at one end, and we have now the federal prosecution at the other end in terms of severity.

Maybe someplace in the middle is more reasonable. I'm never going to criticize a fellow judge for a sentence that was imposed by him or her, but it just struck me.

It's not the first time that state courts, whether it's possession of child pornography or distribution, especially in a case where minors were effected, that there be that kind of a state sentence. I guess we're not really here

1 to debate this, but it just struck me as I was preparing.

MR. GESTRING: It is a concern, I agree, Judge.

And you know what my position is going to be is that the state sentences should be harsher for the actual contact.

THE COURT: I'm inclined to agree. I mean, I do agree. But that's not my job to decide what the state did or should have done. My job is to decide what I should do based on the defendant that's here.

There is a mandatory minimum 10 year sentence, which for a man who is 53, is a significant sentence.

11 | Mandatory minimum could have been greater.

Mr. Miller's prior record is remarkable in terms of its length. I don't know that I've seen one -- I counted 80 convictions. A very high criminal history category that put you in the criminal history category VI several times over.

By my count there were four felonies, which is not something to brag about, four separate felonies. None of them involved crimes of violence.

There were approximately 55 petit larceny convictions over a lengthy period of time. Convictions, based on my experience, is sort of consistent with a booster, someone who steals to have money for a serious addiction problem, but that's 55 convictions over the course of a lifetime.

I mean, was nothing learned from any of those

convictions? Also, there were at least four times when the defendant did his probationary sentence, whether it was -- well, probation or parole was violated. And this offense did occur while Mr. Miller was on probation.

2.3

Sir, you know, you've had convictions for drugs, for unauthorized operation of a vehicle, trespass, criminal impersonation, criminal mischief, possession of forged instrument, possession of stolen property.

According to the presentence report, you have no significant employment history. You've obviously had significant and multiple drug and alcohol abuse problem. You now have serious medical issues perhaps related to some of that, which gets us, of course, to the crime that you stand here convicted of.

Whenever you deal with a minor, minors tend to make serious mistakes of judgment and they rely on adults to do the right thing. And part of this crime is that you enticed minors to do and to pose for the pictures that you took.

I view this as a crime of violence. There was evidence that you did touch them inappropriately. So all of this doesn't paint a very good picture for you, Mr. Miller.

I have felt that the sentencing guideline for child pornography are too severe. Some courts have described them as excentric and fundamentally flawed.

I think to some extent, although these guidelines

are not related to possession of child pornography and the enhancements, as pointed out by the Government, relate to your specific conduct here, the whole area under 2G2.1, 2G2.2, all those guidelines are significantly high.

Many courts have commented that they're not based on empirical data. I think a 30 year sentence is excessive under the circumstances here. Not to minimize what you did, but nonetheless, challenge for the Court is -- not challenge, but the directive to the Court is that the Court errs if it assumes that a guideline sentence is reasonable. The Court commits constitutional error by doing that.

Rather, the Court must examine all of the factors, both good, bad and indifferent after considering the nature of the offense, the history and characteristics of you, the need to promote respect for law, provide just punishment and to provide adequate deterrence, and also under certain circumstances provide the defendant with the needed vocational, medical or psychological care in the most efficient manner.

Certainly the nature of the crime is most reprehensible. The history and characteristics of you, as I say, show a laundry list, lengthy list of over 40 years of committing crimes, albeit misdemeanors. Nonetheless, for each of those crimes there was a victim. Money was stolen, probably never paid back.

That happens once, twice or three or four times,

but 55 petty larceny convictions; 80 convictions overall.

Mr. Gestring mentions the phrase and the concept of deterrence. I think that's a factor, too, not only to deter you, but others that might think that this is something appropriate to do, to film young girls and have them pose are totally inappropriate.

I think in several respects you are a danger to the community not only because of this conduct, but the lengthy record that you have shows repeat, repeat conduct. And I think under 4A1.3 and related sections dealing with whether the criminal history over or under represents the seriousness of your criminal behavior, I think in this case, you know, the likelihood of you offending again I think is pretty remarkably high based on the history that is set forth here in multiple pages of the presentence report concerning the 80 prior convictions.

So I do intend to impose a sentence below the sentencing guidelines. I think the sentencing guidelines 30 years to life is a sentence that is more than necessary to accomplish all the purposes required by the sentencing statute.

Mr. Miller's age and the length of the sentence and the fact there will be a lengthy term of supervised release, which I think allows the Court and its officers to monitor

Mr. Miller.

So as you know, the Court must impose a sentence of at least 120 months. The sentence of the Court is for this plea a sentence -- excuse me, plea and, therefore, conviction is a term of 14 years.

You will get credit for whatever time he has in custody and whatever time the Bureau of Prisons allows.

After considering all the factors, I think such a sentence, a lengthy one, should be sufficient.

I place you on supervised release, Mr. Miller, for a period of 10 years. While on that release, you're not to commit any new crimes -- state or federal.

You're not to possess a firearm.

You're not to submit -- excuse me, you are to submit to random drug testing. And if there continue to be positive reports of drug abuse, you must engage in counseling and treatment as directed.

You must cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample.

While on supervised release you're to notify

Probation of any computers or automated services that you have
so that, if necessary, that can be monitored to make sure you
do not engage in any behavior that might constitute child
pornography.

You must enroll, attend and participate in mental

health intervention while in custody, but while on supervised release treatment designed for the treatment of sexual offenders, because I believe based on this conduct you qualify

as such.

You must also register with the state sex offender registration agency as required by state and federal law, and provide proof of your registration to the supervising probation officer.

Failure to register could result in a new and different crime.

You are not to have any deliberate contact with any child under the age of 18 unless approved by your probation officer and shall not loiter, hang out, or attend places where children congregate: School yards, playgrounds, arcades, et cetera.

You shall submit to a search of your residence, any media that you have, computers to make sure you're complying with the conditions imposed.

You must provide Probation with access to any requested financial information as long as you're on supervision.

The Court will impose a \$100 mandatory special assessment, which is due immediately.

The Court will recommend that Mr. Miller serve his sentence in a suitable Bureau of Prisons medical facility, and

```
would recommend the Butner facility specifically.
                Under the circumstances, the Court declines to
 3
    impose a fine in this case.
 4
                Any other conditions, Mr. Spogen, that I neglected
 5
    to --
 6
                MR. SPOGEN: No, Your Honor.
 7
                MR. GESTRING: Judge, we would ask that the
    defendant have no contact with the victims in this case as
    part of any release conditions.
10
                THE COURT: So ordered.
11
                MR. GESTRING: Thank you, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Complaint to dismiss perhaps?
12
13
                MR. GESTRING: Judge, I think there's open counts of
    an indictment, which the Government would move to dismiss.
14
15
                Also, Judge, the forfeiture of the camera.
                THE COURT: All right, the camera will be forfeited
16
17
    as part of the J & C.
18
                If there are open counts, either complaint or
19
    indictment, they will be dismissed on the Government's motion.
20
                In terms of appeal, defendants have very limited
21
   rights to appeal.
                      In this case, under the plea agreement
   Mr. Miller has given up or waived the right to appeal as long
22
   as the Court's sentence is within the guideline range under
23
24
   the plea agreement or lower, and this sentence meets that
25
   test.
```

So, Mr. Miller, there does not appear to be any 1 2 ability to appeal, but I trust you'll consult with your client 3 and take what steps you believe are appropriate to perfect whatever interest he might have. 5 MR. KENNEDY: Yes, Judge. 6 THE COURT: That is the sentence of the Court. 7 Thank you. 8 MR. GESTRING: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 (WHEREUPON, the proceedings adjourned at 3:41 p.m.) 10 11 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER 12 13 In accordance with 28, U.S.C., 753(b), I certify that 14 this is a true and correct record of proceedings from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the 15 United States District Court for the Western District of New 16 York before the Honorable David G. Larimer on December 17th, 17 2014. 18 19 20 S/ Christi A. Macri 21 Christi A. Macri, FAPR-CRR Official Court Reporter 22

23

24

25